DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 136 176 CG 011 401

AUTHOR Stilwell, William E.
TITLE A Comprehensive Affective-Social Educational System (CASES).
PUB DATE 8 Mar 77
NOTE 16p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Personnel and Guidance Association (Dallas, Texas, March 6-9, 1977); Not available in hard copy due to marginal legibility of original document.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Community Programs; *Comprehensive Programs; Educational Development; *Educational Improvement; *Humanistic Education; Models; *Program Development; Progressive Education; Psychoeducational Processes; *Student Development; Systems Approach

ABSTRACT

This Comprehensive Affective-Social Educational System (CASES) can be developed to reach five program goals: (1) identify the needs for members of each of three constituencies and for the community; (2) specify with each constituent their appropriate student, teacher and/or parent goals; (3) select optimal strategies to facilitate reaching their unique goals; (4) evaluate individual and group progress as well as program effectiveness; and (5) disseminate materials to the constituencies by way of problem prevention. The subsystems for CASES are: (1) obtaining community involvement; (2) assessing affective-social needs; (3) specifying affective-social educational goals; (4) selecting/creating program materials; (5) preparing for CASES installation; (6) implementing CASES; and (7) evaluating CASES. Advantages in the CASES approach are: (1) the overall system is developmental so that information and experience build upon each other in a recorded manner; (2) use of indigenous resources can produce many social and community system changes; (3) the system is not expensive; (4) accountability is built into the system; and (5) relationship and communications skills are developed and practiced by all participants in CASES. (Author/JLL)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

HARD COPY NOT AVAILABLE

ED136176

A COMPREHENSIVE AFFECTIVE-SOCIAL EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM (CASES)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

William E. Stilwell

University of Kentucky

The future for affective-social education is now. The cost measured in terms of human loss demands immediate action. Our record to date, however, has been one of "fits and starts", instead of an overall holistic undertaking. Many students, teachers, and parents apparently need training in affective-social skill development. Many people are hesitant to make the commitment for change. At our fingertips we have most of the ingredients (e.g., mini-theories, curricular packages, teacher in-service, and parent effectiveness programs) for a Comprehensive Affective-Social Educational System (CASES). We must take a risk, seize the opportunity, and build for future human competencies.

The Human Social System

A heuristic model for viewing the student has been developed and researched by Barclay (1964;1976). He has built a strong case for viewing an individual student in terms of three dimensions: (1) peer support, (2) teacher expectations, and (3) self-competency. Each of these three dimensions have been carefully developed and investigated by Barclay and by other sets of researchers. The findings over and over show the dimensions are important, they do interrelate, and they can be merged to predict subsequent performance, i.e., "dropout" (Barclay, 1966) or academic achievement (Barclay, Covert, Scott & Stilwell, 1975).

CG011401

Paper presented during program on "Matching Needs to Intervention Strategies: An Ecological Approach for the Elementary School" at the Annual Meeting of the American Personnel and Guidance Association, Dallas, March 8, 1977.

The Barclay model for viewing a student is heuristic for viewing the other constituents in the educational system. In the case of the student, we can identify four vectors. Three are "input" vectors (peer-support, teacher expectations, and a.. experienced self-competency) which focus upon an epicenter. We will call the epicenter "real self" or "self of the moment". The fourth or "output" vector which is called "performance" emanates from the epicenter. We must add two provisos: (1) experienced self-competency means that in each moment of life the child gains from interactions with the environment and as a result the child's self-competency gains; (2) performance means a wide range of behaviors (e.g., scores on an achievement test, creating an object d'art, or acting out the "class-clown" role). These four vectors can also be found relating to teachers and to parents.

For the classroom teacher in their "real teacher" role, three vectors point toward an epicenter and the fourth vector impinges upon the student. As "input" to the teacher we have colleague support (analogous to peer support), principal's ratings (which are analogous to teacher expectations), and experienced self-competency (as a person and as a teacher). These three "input" vectors merge and produce expectations, management techniques, and judgements.

For the parents we see a similar four-vector model. As input to the parent(s)' performance related to their child, we have familial support ("old" peer-support) which is probably something like "in tact" or "not in-tact", societal expetations (old teacher and principal expectations) which relate to high or low socioeconomic status (e.g., Moynihan, 1965), and experienced parent which relate to success in school

and in child-rearing). In our conceptualization we suspect that these three vectors interact at the parent(s)' epicenter and produce "parental support" upon the child's school performance (Kifer, 1975).

Thus, these three constituences interact in a viable, exciting, and often problemmatic manner. We can plot the student, parent, and teacher on a triangle whose sides represent relationships; the intensity, quality, and competency of which appear to vary dramatically. On two sides of the triangle, the teacher and the parent(s) exert their "productivity vectors" and try to influence the child's performance. On the third side, and too frequently the weakest side, the link between teacher and parent is often judgmental or non-existant. Barclay, Stilwell and Barclay (1972) found that children were judged by their teacher and by their peers in terms of the father's occupation. Often, unfortunately, the "father's job" line of the school record card is the only relationship between teacher and parent. Something has got to be done!

These three constituencies can be viewed as a system. Students, teachers, and parents are at the same time independent and interdependent which allows them to function as if they were a system (Ryan, 1973; Silvern, 1976). Together as a whole, these three constituents, produce a sum which is greater than their respective, individual parts. We must try to consider them together rather than as separate, manageable units.

Now is the time for all of us who are concerned about children to "get our act together". So much of the past research has been tinkering with the ecology of elementary education. Sets of researchers have "majored" in principals, in teachers, in students, in socioeconomic level, or in families. Each set of researchers has claimed <u>their</u> portion of the

achievement variance! Instead of the "bits and pieces" or "cut and fill" approaches, we must undertake a coordinated, managed, and integrated system which has been designed to benefit the three constituencies--students, teachers, and parents--who are involved in education.

Management of Affective Social Education

Somebody has to be "in charge". We will call that person the "Program Manager" and suggest that an effective one is rarely seen and rarely heard!

The Program Manager who is committed to educational-, social-, and institutional-change still has three challenges which are nearly overwhelming: (1) How can we work effectively and meaningfully with the social system represented by students, teachers, and parents? (2) How can we maximize our physical, financial, and human resources which are available in the community for an affective-social education program? and, (3) How can we integrate the social system, the management system, and the host system in a humanly manner? These are difficult questions to answer completely (e.g., Keirsey & Bates, 1973; Hayman & Napier, 1975). Indeed, any answer must be probablistic since we are working with a viable, changing social system.

Elsewhere we have developed a general model for the management of educational-, social, and institutional-change (Stilwell, 1976a) and two specific applications for career education (Mannebach & Stilwell, 1974) and for affective education (Stilwell, 1976b). In the general model seven independent and interdependent functions have been identified: (1) obtain community support; (2) perform needs assessment; (3) specify goals and objectives; (4) select/create program materials; (5) prepare for program

installation; (6) implement program; and (7) evaluate program. In CASES we have modified many of the subsystems to meet the more comprehensive needs of the three constituencies.

Purposes of CASES

A system can be developed to reach five affective-social program goals: (1) identify needs for members of each of the three constituencies and for the community; (2) specify with each constituent their appropriate student-, teacher-, and/or parent-goals; (3) select optimal strategies to facilitate reaching their unique goals; (4) evaluate individual and group progress as well as program effectiveness; and (5) disseminate materials to the constituencies by way of problem-prevention.

The System

The model described by the system can be used in a variety of programs. Elyria (OH) recently completed a three-year project in which many of the comprehensive system activities were implemented (Strnad, Breese, Fernandez, Jones & Smith, 1975). The most recent undertaking, and a very close approximation to CASES, is the ESEA Title III Program in Stuttgart (AR). In this project teams of teachers have been trained with relationship skills, parents have been participating in group experiences, and three times a week the students have been involved in "The Circle". A full report on this program will be given tomorrow (e.g., Stilwell, 1977). The CASES model does not, however, have to be limited to federally funded programs. Cederburg (WI) and Louisville (KY) are undertaking the model with internal funds. In this time of financial restraint, we have to adjust our priorities, our budgets, and our work schedules to meet the evolving demands upon our educational sytems (Stilwell, 1976a). Indeed,

the model is just that, "a model" which can be adapted and integrated over a long period of time. Figure 1 lists the subsystems for CASES. Each function will be briefly discussed.

OBTAIN COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT (1.0). The first function emphasizes organization, planning and commitment from administrators, teachers, parents, and even the children. The full function has five subsystems which are listed and further analyzed in Figure 1.

ASSESS AFFECTIVE-SOCIAL NEEDS (2.0). The collection of needs assessment data must reflect the three constituences served by CASES (i.e., students, teachers, and parents). Further the kind of data collected must be broad-based and, minimally, psychometric, observational, and structured-interview. The theme of this needs assessment is to collect information which "uses the same metric" or can be integrated into a common paradigm. From the collected data it should be possible to "map" constituent groups and to identify "high risk" individuals (students, teachers, and parents).

In addition to the assessment of the social system related to the student (i.e., students, teachers, and parents), the needs assessment function specifies identification and assessment of other human, physical, and financial resources. All too frequently programs appear to be undertaken in the school without organizing the community service agencies.

SPECIFY AFFECTIVE-SOCIAL EDUCATIONAL GOALS (3.0). This third function is highly intractive. Goal statements can be generated and reviewed by three levels of participants (i.e., sponsors, constituent groups, or individuals). We want to promote self-management or responsible actions which can be facilitate by shared goal specification.

Goals suggest objectives. Recently the trend seems toward fewer objectives rather than a myriad. This trend is certainly welcome!

On each level an effort must be made to insure that objectives are articulated within a need area and that objectives are integrated within the student-, teacher-, and parent-social system. The task of articulation and integration is not easy, but the process is communications and relationship and the product is greater self-management for each member of the constituencies. We value both the process and product outcomes in this function.

SELECT/CREATE PROGRAM MATERIALS (4.0). Earlier in this paper we said most of the ingredients for a comprehensive affective-social educational system are available. We believe this function will help us make an accounting of those programs which are available, which need to be modified, and which need to be created. From time to time in our production of curricular materials for students we forget that teachers and parents are also constituents in the educational social system. Kids have all the fun, but possibly some teachers and other parents need or want to have some fun too! The detail for this function is listed in Table 1.

PREPARE FOR CASES INSTALLATION (5.0). Heretofore the planning on a management level has occurred, comprehensive assessment has been described, goals have been specified, and curricular materials have been developed for CASES. The actual agents of change (e.g., teachers, parents, social workers, psychologists, and counselors) need massive preparation experiences through workshops, simulations, and consultations. For too long we have had "professionals" guarding carefully their domains. CASES obliges these men and women to lower their barriers so that professional-to-professional,

professional-to-client, and professional-to-paraprofessional communications occur without reservation or restraint (Stilwell & Santoro, 1976).

IMPLEMENT CASES (6.0). Once all the groundwork has been laid CASES can proceed in its most holistic manner. Within this "go" function the "nuts and bolts" of change occur. People interact. Data are collected. The full excitement and drama of CASES occur in this function.

EVALUATE CASES (7.0). Our model for CASES depicts internal and external evaluation. Both evaluations are important to the revision of the system and to the improved performance of constituents and participants.

Our internal evaluation deals with the changes by our various constituents. On the most sensitive level we want to become accountable for what is or is not occurring in the cases of individual or groups of constituents. These data are of two types: immediate impact (short term change) and long term impact (follow-up). Both kinds of data can help improve the quality of information in an intervention reference system. Further we would want to keep track of how well our constituents performed as a result of their contact with outside agencies. That information is also integrated into the reference system. This internal evaluation must occur on a continuous basis.

Our external evaluation occurs periodically. In addition to the monitoring activities found in the continuous evaluation subsystem, CASES program managers must provide data to the external funding agencies (if any) and to "consumer groups" (taxpayers, constituents). An attempt should be made to enlist "friendly adversaries" who will both support and probe CASES. Accountability can be sharpened by these periodic external evaluations.

Summary

Each school system can develop its own reasons for acting on affective-social education now. Any delay potentially has a cost to students, teachers, and parents in terms of their success, satisfaction, and happiness. We should act now. In CASES we see these advantages:

1) the overall system is developmental so that information and experience build upon each other in a recorded manner. In CASES we are promoting the use of a "common metric" or a common set of terms to facilitate communications;

2) the use of indigenous resources (human, physical, and financial) can produce many social and community system changes. Teachers can become more involved in planning and decision-making. At the same time parents can become more involved by using the school building for life-long learning programs and for community group meetings. We see teachers, counselors, psychologists, social workers, paraprofessionals, parents, and students functioning as change agents;

3) the system is not expensive. Many school systems employ the necessary people, collect the appropriate data, and provide for in-service training;

4) accountability is built into the system. Assessment data on the three constituencies help create a matrix for predicting and evaluating change in the human social system. The data further provide optimal ("best way") information for intervention selection, for long range planning, and for dissemination; and,

5) relationship and communications skills are developed and practiced by all participants in CASES. The elixir for CASES is communications; the experiences will help each participant

throughout their life.

We have a unique opportunity to take from "the best", integrate them into a taxonomy (Barclay, 1976, 1977), and design a coordinated, holistic system so the affective activities for students, the in-service training programs for teachers, and the educational groups for parents occur in a complementary manner. In John Kennedy's words, "All the boats will rise with the tide" (so will all the participants in CASES).

Table 1: Comprehensive Affective-Social Educational System (CASES)'s Functions and Subsystems

1.0 OBTAIN COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT
- 1.1 Obtain board/administrative commitment
- 1.2 Organize key groups
  - 1.2.1 Contact teachers' union
  - 1.2.2 Contact parent and neighborhood groups
  - 1.2.3 Contact sources of external funding
  - 1.2.4 Develop management teams
- 1.3 Develop awareness for affective-social education
  - 1.3.1 Stimulate constituencies' awareness
  - 1.3.1.1 Invite teachers to workshops
  - 1.3.1.2 Explore possibility with parents
  - 1.3.1.3 Discuss possibility with students
  - 1.3.2 Contact major media
- 1.4 Explore other programs
  - 1.4.1 Consider in-service training programs
  - 1.4.2 Consider family management or parenting programs
  - 1.4.3 Consider curricular packages
  - 1.4.4 Visit on-going programs
- 1.5 Refine purpose for CASES
  - 1.5.1 Decide to abandon the program
  - 1.5.2 Decide to continue with CASES
  - 1.5.3 Develop guidelines for participants

2.0 ASSESS AFFECTIVE-SOCIAL NEEDS
- 2.1 Select/develop psychometrics
  - 2.1.1 Prepare student materials
  - 2.1.2 Prepare teacher materials
  - 2.1.3 Prepare parent materials
- 2.2 Select/develop observation materials
  - 2.2.1 Prepare student materials
  - 2.2.2 Prepare teacher materials
  - 2.2.3 Prepare parent materials
- 2.3 Select/develop interview protocols
  - 2.3.1 Prepare student materials
  - 2.3.2 Prepare teacher materials
  - 2.3.3 Prepare parent materials
- 2.4 Administer assessment program
  - 2.4.1 Organize assessment teams
  - 2.4.2 Train observers
  - 2.4.3 Train interviewers
  - 2.4.4 Collect data
- 2.5 Integrate affective-social data
  - 2.5.1 "Map" data for constituent groups
  - 2.5.2 Indicate "high risk" individuals
- 2.6 Inventory resources
  - 2.6.1 Identify change agents
  - 2.6.1.1 Specify agents for students
  - 2.6.1.2 Specify agents for teachers
  - 2.6.1.3 Specify agents for parents
  - 2.6.2 Identify financial resources
  - 2.6.2.1 Specify district funds
  - 2.6.2.2 Specify state funds
  - 2.6.2.3 Specify federal funds

2.6.3 Identify physical resources
2.6.3.1 Specify meeting places
2.6.3.2 Specify equipment

3.0 SPECIFY AFFECTIVE-SOCIAL EDUCATIONAL GOALS
3.1 Develop goals statements
3.1.1 Prepare for sponsors
3.1.2 Prepare for constituents
3.1.3 Prepare for individuals
3.2 Prepare program milestones
3.2.1 Select minimum criteria
3.2.2 Specify schedules
3.2.3 Develop "go/nogo" decision rules
3.3 Specify CASES product objectives
3.3.1 Prepare articulated/integrated objectives
3.3.1.1 Prepare for constituencies
3.3.1.2 Prepare for individuals
3.4 Revise objectives as needed

4.0 SELECT/CREATE PROGRAM MATERIALS
4.1 Consider materials for constituents
4.1.1 Select/create student materials
4.1.2 Select/create teacher materials
4.1.3 Select/create parent materials
4.2 Adopt programs
4.2.1 Reject program materials
4.2.2 Adopt materials
4.3 Adapt programs
4.3.1 Reject program materials
4.3.2 Revise program materials
4.3.3 Accept revised materials
4.4 Create programs
4.4.1 Create materials
4.4.2 Assess materials
4.4.3 Reject created materials
4.4.4 Revise created materials
4.4.5 Accept revised materials
4.5 Develop decision rules for materials useage

5.0 PREPARE FOR CASES INSTALLATION
5.1 Orient change agents
5.2 Organize teams by constituencies
5.2.1 Use learning teams for students
5.2.2 Use consultant teams for teachers
5.2.3 Use child/family study teams for parents
5.3 Conduct in-service training for teams
5.3.1 Use consultants
5.3.2 Use simulations
5.3.3 Use common language
5.3.4 Use "common metric"
5.4 Revise team compositions
5.5 Train non-change agents for maintenance
5.5.1 Enlist/train paraprofessionals
5.5.2 Enlist/train peer supporters
5.5.3 Enlist/train additional teachers

Table 1
CASES
page thirteen

6.0 IMPLEMENT CASES
- 6.1 Maintain continuous in-service training
- 6.2 Select affective-social strategies
  - 6.2.1 Match needs/objectives
    - 6.2.1.1 Match for constituencies
    - 6.2.1.2 Match for individuals
  - 6.2.2 Consider affective-social strategies
    - 6.2.2.1 Rank alternatives
    - 6.2.2.2 Select primary strategy
    - 6.2.2.3 Specify "back-up" strategy
    - 6.2.2.4 Specify monitoring criteria
      - 6.2.2.4.1 List change agent responsibilities
      - 6.2.2.4.2 Specify milestones
      - 6.2.2.4.2 Specify outcomes
    - 6.2.2.5 Revise as needed
- 6.3 Implement primary strategy
- 6.4 Maintain performance level

7.0 EVALUATE CASES
- 7.1 Conduct internal evaluations
  - 7.1.1 Collect immediate impact data
    - 7.1.1.1 Administer assessment program
      - 7.1.1.1.1 Use psychometrics
      - 7.1.1.1.2 Use observations
      - 7.1.1.1.3 Use interviews
    - 7.1.1.2 Compare objectives/data
    - 7.1.1.3 Revise affective-social strategy
    - 7.1.1.4 Recommend "back-up" strategy
  - 7.1.2 Collect long range impact data
    - 7.1.2.1 Use strategy completion data
    - 7.1.2.2 Use strategy failure data
- 7.2 Maintain CASES Reference System
  - 7.2.1 Use assessment/objective/strategy data
  - 7.2.2 Disseminate probability data
    - 7.2.2.1 Use for in-service training
    - 7.2.2.2 Use for selecting "best" strategy
  - 7.2.3 Maintain referral system
    - 7.2.3.1 Identify outside agencies
    - 7.2.3.2 Collect "consumer ratings"
    - 7.2.3.3 Evaluate agencies for services
- 7.3 Conduct external evaluations
- 7.4 Analyze/report results
  - 7.4.1 Disseminate results within program
  - 7.4.2 Disseminate results within community
  - 7.4.3 Disseminate results to ERIC
  - 7.4.4 Disseminate results to sponsors

REFERENCES

Barclay, J. R. Studies in sociometry and teacher ratings: A diagnostic and predictive combination for school psychology. Pocatello, ID: Idaho State University, 1964.

Barclay, J. R. Sociometric choices and teacher ratings as predictors of school dropout. Journal of School Psychology, 1966, 4, 40-44.

Barclay, J. R. The psychology of intervention. Lexington, KY: Educational Skills Development, 1976.

Barclay, J. R. A taxonomy of affective-social skill intervention. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Personnel and Guidance Association, Dallas, March, 1977.

Barclay, J. R., Covert, R. M., Scott, T. W., & Stilwell, W. E. Some effects of school: A three year follow-up project report. Prepared for Vigo County School Corporation, Terre Haute, IN, 1975.

Barclay, J. R., Stilwell, W. E., & Barclay, L. K. The influence of paternal occupation on social interaction measures of elementary school children. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 1972, 2, 433-446.

Hayman, J. L., & Napier, R. N. Evaluation in the schools: A human process for renewal. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole, 1975.

Keirsey, D., & Bates, M. Result system management: The human side of accountability. San Francisco: California Counseling and Guidance Association, 1973.

Kifer, E. W. Relationship between academic achievement and personality characteristics: A quasi-longitudinal study. American Educational Research Journal, 1975, 12, 191-210.

Mannebach, A. J., & Stilwell, W. E. Installing career education: A systems approach. Vocational Guidance Quarterly, 1974, 22, 180-188.

Moynihan, D. The Negro family: The case for national action. Washington, D.C.: Office of Policy Planning and Research, U.S. Department of Labor, 1965.

Ryan, T. A. A conceptual model of career development. Educational Technology, 1973, 13(6), 28-38.

Silvern, L. C. Introduction. In L. C. Silvern (Ed.), Systems engineering of education II: Application of systems thinking to the administration of instruction. Los Angeles: Educational and Training Consultants, 1976.

Stilwell, W. E A systems approach for social-, educational, or institutional-change. In L. C. Silvern (Ed.), Systems engineering of education II: Application of systems thinking to the administration of instruction. Los Angeles: Educational and Training Consultants, 1976, 79-88(a).

Stilwell, W. E. A systems approach for implementing an affective education program. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1976, 15, 200-210(b).

Stilwell, W. E., & Santoro, D. A. A training model for the 80's. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1976, 54, 322-326.

Stilwell, W. E. Effects of a developmental guidance program on the affective-social development of third and fourth graders. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Personnel and Guidance Association, Dallas, March, 1977.

Strnad, L., Breese, L., Fernandez, C., Jones, N. A., & Smith, W. J. Accountability in elementary school guidance services: Project Termination Report for ESEA Title III. Elyria (OH) City Schools. Project 45-72-332, 1972-1975.